REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2006, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration. Claim(s) 1, 4-10, 12-17, 20-24, 26-29, 31-32 and 34-37 are now pending in this Application.

In this Amendment, claim(s) 1, 17, 26, 31, 32, 34 and 35 have been amended and claim(s) 11, 38 and 25 have been cancelled. Claim(s) 1, 17, 31, 32, 34 and 35 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101:

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-17,20-29,31-32 and 34-38 based on non-statutory subject matter. In response, claims 1 and 32 have been herein amended to recite "an encoded set of processor based instructions encoded on a computer readable medium for performing, via a processor responsive to the instructions, a method of organizing and generating report data", to clarify the claimed subject matter and is now fully within the guidelines of the USPTO with respect to computer related inventions.

Further, claims 1, 17, 31, 32, 34 and 35 have been herein amended to recite "generating an ordered output display set of entries in a tangible medium of expression on the graphical user output device," to further clarify the tangible result of the claimed subject matter within the context of 35 U.S.C. §101. It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Woodmansee '140 (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0178140) in view of Myhrvold '166 (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,166):

Prior to discussing claimed distinctions between applicant's system and the cited art, a brief review of applicant's disclosure may be beneficial. Applicant's system performs processing of large data sets that may be too large to store in memory. The disclosed approach employs an exemplary storage area network (SAN), in which the large data sets include manageable entities such as disk drives in the storage area network. In such a SAN, a large number of storage arrays may each include a large number of disk drives. Accordingly, the number of data records needed to generate a report of disk drives, for example, becomes unwieldy (i.e. too large) to store in memory.

The claimed solution includes a two-pass approach that first scans the records without loading the entire record to identify records that are needed for a given report. A second pass then loads full records, but only those flagged in the first pass. Thus, neither pass nor the resulting report requires loading of all records simultaneously. The output of applicant's system is a screen-paged report of the SAN entities for which information is sought. Applicant's invention is motivated by the observation that, in a large SAN, a user may initiate a query that implicates, say, 100 screens of entries, yet is interested in only 1 or 2. The claimed method avoids loading all 100 screen's worth of data, and allows the first scan to tag the 1 or 2 screen's worth of records, then load only those 1 or 2 screen's worth of records in entirety.

Turning now to the Office communication, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-8, 11, 15-17, 20-24, 27, 32, 34 and 35 based on Woodmansee '140 in view of Myhrvold '166. For the reasons discussed below, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Woodmansee '140 teaches a system that extracts data sets (records) into a spreadsheet application via a filter, then processes the spreadsheet records through graphical presentation software for presentation as a slide show, as discussed at paragraph [0041]. The present application describes a system that performs a lightweight first pass, accumulating entries in a candidate set, by retaining only the selection and arrangement fields employed by the filtering

criteria (page 15, lines 15-19). Thus, the filter (selection) criteria does not retrieve full records, but only index fields to the full record. In contrast, in Woodmansee '140, the first pass retrieves all records in full that are intended for output display.

Therefore, Woodmansee does not teach, alone or in combination, that the filtering in the first pass designates a subset of entities for inclusion in the output report, the filtering operable on one or more of the fields for selective inclusion. Rather, Woodmansee operates on (retrieves) the entire record for inclusion in the output report. Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claim 11 to recite filtering according to the filtering criteria, the filtering operable to designate a subset of entries for inclusion in the first pass and the filtering criteria operable on at least one of the fields for comparison and selective inclusion in the designated subset, as discussed further at page 14, line 29-page 15 line 5.

The Office Action suggests that Woodmansee teaches the subject matter of claim 11 at [0014]. Woodmansee, however, does not apply selection criteria to a subset, but rather selects whole records into the spreadsheet application for later processing. The claimed invention does not load whole records until a second pass, at which time it loads only the records identified (flagged) during the first pass. Accordingly, Woodmansee does not teach or disclose the claimed designat[ing] a subset of entries for inclusion in the first pass, as now recited in amended claim 1. Independent claims 32 and 34 has been similarly amended, and are therefore likewise believed allowable.

With respect to claim 17, the Office Action continues to combine the Myhrvold '166 reference to imply a second pass. Myhrvold, however, is concerned with the use of gsprites in rendering 3d image data, not with normalized tabular (chart based) data. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill would not look to Myhrvold '166 to modify Woodmansee '140 because Myhrvold is concerned with highly mathematical and computational intensive operations such as 3d scaling and rotation (col. 7, line 63-col 8, line 11) using gsprites, not tabular

data as in Woodmansee '140. Accordingly, claim 17, rejected on similar grounds as claim 1, has been further amended with the subject matter of claim 25 to recite that <u>the set of data [is]arranged in a predetermined data set format, the data set format operable to designate entries corresponding to rows and fields corresponding to columns</u>, to further clarify the nature of tabular data. Myhrvold does not show, teach, or disclose, alone or in combination, operation on such a tabular predetermined data set format. Accordingly, claim 17 is deemed further distinguished over Woodmansee and Myhrvold.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Woodmansee '140 in view of Myhrvold '166 and Jamshidi '497 (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,497):

The Office Action proposes Jamshidi '497 as teaching the subject matter of claim 25. Jamshidi, however, shows a bi-directional linking of RDBMS fields to spreadsheet fields (col. 2, lines 33-40). Such operation is not the focus of the claimed first and second passes. The claimed first and second passes represent a unidirectional parsing of data that need not employ nor would benefit from a seamless or bi-directional linking as taught by Jamshidi.

Further, even if one were to modify Woodmansee according to Myhrvold, the invention according to the present claims would not be realized because the multi-pass approach in Myhrvold performs multiple passes on the same pixel region (graphic output screen) of data (col. 13, lines 1-23). The Myhrvold rendered data is "fed back through" the texture processor (col. 10, line 24). Therefore, the multiple passes pertain to the same data set, not to a reduced subset of data as claimed in amended claim 1.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Woodmansee '140 in view of Myhrvold '166 and Cuckson '646 (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0193646):

Claim 31 has been rejected on similar ground as claim 1, and further with respect to Cuckson '646. Accordingly, claim 31 has been amended with the subject matter of claim 11, and further amended with the subject matter of claims 15 and 16 to recite that the <u>first pass further compris[es] filtering entries for</u>

omission from the candidate set and comparing key fields in entries for inclusion in the candidate set, and further that the parsed entries of the second pass require substantially less memory than the first pass such that the parsed entries of the second pass are stored simultaneously in memory, the second pass further comprising matching entries for inclusion in the candidate set, sorting entries in the candidate set, and formatting entries in the candidate set for display on the output device, to further clarify and distinguish claim 31 over the combination of Woodmansee, Myhrvold and Cuckson '646. Nowhere, alone or in combination, does Woodmansee or Myhrvold disclose the memory saving operation of the first pass (only key fields retrieved) and the second pass (subset of entries received). As discussed above, the multi-pass approach of Myhrvold feeds the SAME DATA of the rendered image back through the processor; no showing, teaching or disclosure of memory savings between first and second passes is disclosed.

Cuckson '646 teaches obtaining a range of data items from each of a plurality of data environments [0019]. The present claims perform first and second passes on the same large data set in a SAN environment; no subdivisions or portions of data from multiple environments is performed. Further, Cuckson does not employ or require multiple passes as recited in claim 31. Accordingly, one of skill in the art would not look to Cuckson '646 to modify either Woodmansee or Myhrvold, and even if one did, the invention claimed in claim 31 still would not be realized.

Claim 35, also rejected on similar grounds as claim 1, has been herein amended with the subject matter of claims 11 as above and with the subject matter of claim 38, to clarify the notion that the parsed entries of the second pass require substantially less memory than the first pass such that the parsed entries of the second pass are stored simultaneously in memory, as discussed above.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 17, 31, 32, 34 and 35, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the case are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC03-21(03115)

Dated: November 9, 2006